Remarks

1.   Summary of the Office Action

In the Office Action mailed December 27, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 8, 18, and 32-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention; the Examiner rejected claims 1-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by "Sprint PCS J2ME Application Environment," an article by Scott Papineau, (hereinafter "the Papineau reference"), and the Examiner objected to claims 2, 15, 25, 29, and 33 for having typographical errors.   Additionally, the Examiner objected to the specification because it contained an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code.

2.   Amendments and Pending Claims

Applicant has amended the specification by deleting a paragraph, adding a new paragraph, and providing replacement paragraphs so as to delete the embedded hyperlinks and/or other form of browser executable code or to correct typographical errors.   Support for the amendment to the paragraph starting at page 30, line 17, is located in the specification at page 31, Table 7.   Support for the new paragraph added after Table 8 on page 34 is located at original claims 7 and 17.   Support for the amendment to the paragraph starting at page 36, line 15, is located at Figure 9.   Support for the amendment to the paragraph starting at page 47, line 7, is located at Figure 11.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 3-6, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 19, 20, 22-24, 27, 28, and 31, cancelled claims 2, 7, 8, 15, 17, 18, 25, 29, and 32-37, and added new claims 38-43.   Claims 1, 3-6, 9-14, 16, 19-24, 26-28, 30, 31, and 38-43 are presently pending in this application.   Claims 1, 14, 24, and 28 are independent.

Support for the amendments to claims 1, 3-6, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 19, 20, 22-24, 27, 28, and 31 is located in the specification at page 46, lines 1-22, page 47, line 17 to page 48, line 3, and Figure 11.

Support for new claims 38, 40, 42, and 43 is located in the specification at page 13, line 7 to page 14, line 6, and original claims 2, 15, 25, and 29. Support for new claims 39 and 41 is located in the specification at page 47, lines 12-16, Figure 7, and original claims 7 and 17.

3. Payment of Fees

A fee of $1,020.00 is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a)(3) for a Petition for an Extension of time being submitted herewith and a fee of $180.00 is required for submission of an Information Disclosure Statement. The Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge these fees and any other fee(s) that may be required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17 to Deposit Account No. 210765.

4. Response to Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 2, 15, 25, 29, and 33 for having typographical errors. Applicant has cancelled claims 2, 15, 25, 29, and 33. Applicant submits the objection of claims 2, 15, 25, 29, and 33 is now moot. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection of claims 2, 15, 25, 29, and 33.

5. Response to the Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 8, 18, and 32-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has cancelled claims 8, 18, and 32-37. Applicant submits the rejection of claims 8, 18, and 32-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second

- 19 -

paragraph, is now moot. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 8, 18, and 32-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

6.   Response to the Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Papineau reference. Applicant has cancelled claims 2, 7, 8, 15, 17, 18, 25, 29, and 32-37. Applicant submits the rejection of claims 2, 7, 8, 15, 17, 18, 25, 29, and 32-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is now moot. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 2, 7, 8, 15, 17, 18, 25, 29, and 32-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Under M.P.E.P. § 2131, a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Independent claims 1, 14, 24, and 28 clearly distinguish over the Papineau reference, because the Papineau reference does not disclose or suggest each and every element as recited in any of these claims.

In particular, the Papineau reference does not teach or suggest (i) appending the second input data to the first input data, and passing the first input data and the appended second input data to a first Java MIDlet in a first MIDlet suite on the mobile information device in response to a request from the first Java MIDlet, as recited in claim 1, (ii) appending the second input data to the first input data, and passing the first input data and the appended second input data to an application on the mobile information device in response to a request from the application on the mobile information device, as recited in claim 14, (iii) appending the second output data to the first output data, and passing the first output data and the appended second output data to the application in response to a request from the application, as recited in claim 24, or (iv) appending the second output data to the first output data, and passing the first output data and the appended

- 20 -

second output data to the first MIDlet in response to a request from the first MIDlet, as recited in claim 28.

At best, the Papineau reference teaches: (i) a "Muglet" for passing context in to a MIDlet and an "Exit URI" for passing context out from a Muglet, (ii) an Application Management System can pass context in to a MIDlet using a Muglet class and can process context passed out from a MIDlet using the "Exit URI" in a system class, (iii) a "Class Muglet" allows a MIDlet to receive input parameters and data upon invocation, (iv) a "java.lang.String getReferring URI()" returns a string that can be passed to a "System.setExitURI()" to return control to a referring entity, and (v) a "java.lang.String getURI()" for a MediaType handler passes a URI to a clipboard. (See, e.g., the Papineau reference, pages 27-30, 34, and 37).

However, these portions of the Papineau reference, alone or in combination with the rest of the Papineau reference, do not teach or suggest appending the second input data to the first input data or appending the second output data to the first output data for at least the reason that the Papineau reference does not teach or suggest appending data, and in particular, appending input data, as recited in claims 1 and 14 or appending output data, as recited in claims 24, and 28.

Additionally, these portions of the Papineau reference, alone or in combination with the rest of the Papineau reference, do not teach or suggest passing the first input data and the appended second input data to a first Java MIDlet (or to an application) in response to a request from the first Java MIDlet (or from the application), or passing the first output data and the appended second output data to a first MIDlet (or to an application) in response to a request from the first MIDlet (or from the application) for at least the reason that the Papineau reference does not teach or suggest passing first input data and appended second input data in response to a

- 21 -

request or passing first output data and appended second output data in response to a request, as recited in claims 1, 14, 24, and 28.

Applicant submits that claims 1, 14, 24, and 28 are allowable because the Papineau reference fails to disclose or suggest the combination of limitations recited in any of claims 1, 14, 24, and 28. Further, without conceding the assertions made by the Examiner regarding dependent claims 3-6, 9-13, 16, 19-23, 26, 27, 30, and 31, Applicant submits that dependent claims 3-6, 9-13, 16, 19-23, 26, 27, 30, and 31 are allowable for at least the reason that they each depend from one of allowable claims 1, 14, 24, and 28. Additionally, Applicant submits new claims 38-43 are allowable for at least the reason that they each depend from one of allowable claims 1, 14, 24, and 28.

7. Conclusion

Applicant believes that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this response. However, failure to address a specific rejection or assertion made by the Examiner does not signify that Applicant agrees with or concedes that rejection or assertion.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1, 3-6, 9-14, 16, 19-24, 26-28, 30, 31, and 38-43 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

MCDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP

Date: _June 26_, 2007   By: _David Ciesielski_
                                   David L. Ciesielski
                                   Reg. No. 57,432